



PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 06530.0311

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
)
Otto E. ANDERHUB et al.) Group Art Unit: 3731
)
Application No.: 10/720,668) Examiner: DAWSON, GLENN K
)
Filed: November 25, 2003)
)
For: A FORCEPS AND COLLECTION) Confirmation No.: 6222
ASSEMBLY AND RELATED)
METHODS OF USE AND)
MANUFACTURE)
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RESPONSE TO OFFICE COMMUNICATION

In the Office Communication mailed August 30, 2007, the Examiner asserts that the Applicant's Reply to Office Action of June 12, 2007 was not "fully responsive" to the prior Office Action mailed February 21, 2007 because "the Applicant failed to state exactly how new claim 91 is patentable over previously applied reference to Turkel." See paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Communication.

Applicant notes that claim 91 recites all the features of previously un-amended claim 1. According to the Office Action mailed February 21, 2007, un-amended claim 1 was not rejected based on Turkel. Thus, according to that Office Action, Turkel did not include every feature of un-amended claim 1. And, therefore, Turkel does not include every feature of claim 91. For example, Turkel does not disclose the configuration of

the claimed holder. Accordingly, claim 91 is allowable for at least this reason.

Additionally, claims 92-93 depend from claim 91 are allowable for at least this reason.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this Response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 19, 2007

By: _____


Leslie I. Bookoff
Reg. No. 38,084
(202) 408-4140